

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COMMISSION ON

PEACE OFFICERS STANDARDS AND TRAINING

POST COMMISSION

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, 2021

10:06 A.M.

MEETING HELD

VIA ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE AND AT THE OFFICES OF

COMMISSION ON POST

860 STILL WATER ROAD, SUITE 100

WEST SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

STENOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED BY:
Veronica A. Guerrero
California Certified Shorthand Reporter #14129

A P P E A R A N C E S

POST FINANCE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

RANDY WALTZ

California Association of Police
Training Officers
Public Member
(Acting Chairperson)

ELMO BANNING

Public Member
(Via Zoom)

ALEX BERNARD

Public Member
(Via Zoom)

EZERY BEAUCHAMP

California Highway Patrol

DAVID HONDA

California Peace Officers Association

KATHY OBORN

California Association of Administration
Of Justice Educators
(Via Zoom)

JASON SALAZAR

California Police Chiefs Association
(Via Zoom)

DAMIEN SANDOVAL

California Academy Directors' Association (CADA)
(Via Zoom)

ERIC SCHMIDT

Peace Officers Research Association
Of California
(Via Zoom)

PHILLIP WEBB

Los Angeles School Police Department
(Via Zoom)

A P P E A R A N C E S C O N T I N U E D

POST ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT
(CONTINUED)

SHENEUI WEBER
California Community College
Chancellor's Office
(Via Zoom)

JAMIE YOUNG
Public Safety Dispatcher
Advisory Council
(Via Zoom)

---oOo---

POST COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT

MANUEL ALVAREZ, JR.
Executive Director
Executive Office

SCOTT LOGGINS
Assistant Executive Director
Standards and Development Division
Executive Office

KIRK BUNCH
Law Enforcement Consultant
Basic Training Bureau

JIM GROTTKAU
Bureau Chief
Basic Training Bureau

A P P E A R A N C E S C O N T I N U E D

POST COMMISSION STAFF
(CONTINUED)

RAYMUND NANADIEGO
Law Enforcement Consultant
Basic Training Bureau

KERI NUNEZ
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Executive Office

KATIE STRICKLAND
Staff Services Analyst
Executive Office

---oOo---

1	I N D E X	
2	PROCEEDINGS	PAGE
3	CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME	7
4	CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME COMMITTEE MEMBERS	7
5	MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING THE OFFICERS WHO LOST	7
6	THEIR LIVES IN THE LINE OF DUTY SINCE THE LAST	
	MEETING	
7	ROLL CALL OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS	7
8	PUBLIC COMMENT (none)	--
9	INTRODUCTIONS OF POST ADVISORY VICE CHAIR,	9
10	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	
11	A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	10
12	Approval of the Action Summary and Minutes	
	of the previous Committee meeting.	
13	Action Summary - February 24, 2021	
14	Meeting Minutes - February 24, 2021	
15	B. ANNOUNCEMENTS (None)	--
16	C. REVIEW OF COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA	11
17	D. PRESENTATIONS	
18	Agenda Item 12 -- Report on the Update of	20
	1070 Instructor Refresher Training	
19	Agenda Item G -- Report on Request to Amend	31
20	Regulation 1081, Requirement For Human	
	Trafficking	
21	E. ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS	31
22	F. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS (None)	--
23	G. OLD BUSINESS (None)	--
24	H. NEW BUSINESS	
25		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PROCEEDINGS	PAGE
Letter from Craig Lally, President, California Coalition of Law Association (CCLA), nominating President Juan Viramontes, Association of Orange County Deputy Sheriffs, for appointment to the Advisory Committee replacing Sr. Deputy Coroner Artin Baron.	38
Letter from Carol Leveroni, Executive Director, California Peace Officers Association (CPOA) nominating Lieutenant Eric Swift, Nape County Sheriff Department, for Appointment to the Advisory Committee replacing Dave Honda.	38
I. FUTURE MEETINGS	40
Upcoming Committee Meetings:	
September 1-2 -- Pasadena	
December 8-9 -- POST, West Sacramento	
2022:	
March 2-3 -- location is to be determined	
May 25-26 -- POST, West Sacramento	
ADJOURNMENT	41
CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	42
ERRATA SHEET	43

1 Wednesday, June 2, 2021, 10:00 A.M.

2 Zoom and West Sacramento, California

3 ---oOo---

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Good morning, and welcome
5 to the meeting of the Advisory Committee. I would like to
6 call the meeting to order.

7 We will start our meeting with a moment of silence,
8 honoring the officers who lost their lives in the line of
9 duty since our last meeting.

10 The following officers died in the line of duty
11 since the last meeting: Deputy Thomas J. Albanese, Los
12 Angeles Sheriffs Department; Officer Jose Anzora, Los
13 Angeles Police Department; Detective Luca Benedetti, San
14 Luis Obispo Police Department; Officer Jimmy Inn, Stockton
15 Police Department. And, just Monday afternoon, our own
16 commissioner, Sheriff McMahon from San Bernardino County
17 Sheriffs Department, lost Sergeant Dominic Baca.

18 Moment of science, please.

19 (Moment of silence observed.)

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Thank you.

21 Can we have a roll call of the committee, please.

22 MS. STRICKLAND: Banning?

23 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Committee Members, please
24 unmute your microphones and respond.

25 MEMBER BANNING: Banning's here.

1 MS. STRICKLAND: Thank you.
2 Bernard.
3 MEMBER BERNARD: Here.
4 MS. STRICKLAND: Beauchamp.
5 MEMBER BEAUCHAMP: Here.
6 MS. STRICKLAND: DiBasilio.
7 (No response.)
8 MS. STRICKLAND: Honda.
9 MR. HONDA: Here.
10 MS. STRICKLAND: Oborn.
11 MEMBER OBORN: Here.
12 MS. STRICKLAND: Salazar.
13 MEMBER SALAZAR: Here.
14 MS. STRICKLAND: Sandoval.
15 MEMBER SANDOVAL: Here.
16 MS. STRICKLAND: Schmidt.
17 MEMBER SCHMIDT: Here.
18 MS. STRICKLAND: Waltz.
19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Here.
20 MS. STRICKLAND: Webb.
21 MEMBER WEBB: Here.
22 MS. STRICKLAND: Weber.
23 MEMBER WEBER: Here.
24 MS. STRICKLAND: And Young.
25 MEMBER WEBER: Here.

1 MS. STRICKLAND: Thank you.

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: I will now introduce
3 our -- we don't have a vice chair right now -- Executive
4 Director Manny Alvarez; Assistant Executive Director is
5 Maria Sandoval and Scott Loggins.

6 Now, is the time set aside for members of the public
7 to comment on items of the agenda. The Chair will manage
8 public comment period in deference to the committee's
9 workload and meeting time constraints. Up to 15 minutes is
10 allotted at the beginning of each meeting for public
11 comments on items on the agenda. Based on recent events,
12 more people than usual may want to address the committee.
13 Therefore, if required, we will go longer than 15 minutes,
14 but may limit this period to no more than one hour as we
15 have many topics to cover on the agenda.

16 Members of the public who wish to speak are asked to
17 limit their remarks to no more than 5 minutes each.

18 If we have many people who wish to speak on the same
19 topic, I, as the chair, may intervene and will ask that you
20 limit remarks to no more than that one minute. Pursuant to
21 existing commission policy, the Chair may conclude the
22 public comment period if multiple speakers are voicing
23 repetitive or similar statements and the 15-minute public
24 comment period has expired.

25 Please remember that this meeting is being

1 transcribed. So I may politely interrupt and ask you to
2 repeat or speak slowly and clearly so your comment can be
3 correctly captured in the transcript.

4 If there is anyone watching who would like to
5 address the committee during public comment, please call in
6 to the number shown on the screen at this time. We will
7 take the calls on a first-come, first-served basis. If
8 other persons are in the queue waiting to speak, you will be
9 placed on hold until it is your turn to address the
10 committee.

11 You will know when it is your turn to speak when you
12 hear that you are unmuted. Once again, you will know it is
13 your turn to speak when you hear "unmuted." We will wait
14 for approximately one minute to allow for individuals to
15 call in. When it is your turn, if you wish, please state
16 your name and organization.

17 Do we have any public comments?

18 (No response.)

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: We'll move to the
20 approval of the minutes -- the approval of the Action
21 Summary Minutes from the previous commission meeting, which
22 was February 24th, 2021.

23 I will entertain a motion to approve.

24 MEMBER BERNARD: Bernard. Motion to approve.

25 MEMBER WEBB: Webb. Second.

1 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Is there any discussion
2 or comments?

3 (No Response.)

4 No comments.

5 All in favor say "Aye."

6 (Ayes in unison.)

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Are there any opposed?
8 State "nay."

9 (No response.)

10 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Motion carries.

11 Are there any announcements?

12 (No response.)

13 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: We will move to the
14 review of the Commission Meeting Agenda.

15 MR. LOGGINS: Thank you very much. Good morning,
16 Undersheriff Waltz, and, once again, thank you very much for
17 filling in as the acting chair of this advisory committee.
18 And I'm Assistant Executive Director Scott Loggins.

19 For the committee members, before you, you've seen
20 the agenda item for this afternoon's meeting. It is a
21 comparatively light agenda item compared to other meetings,
22 nevertheless, there's a lot of work that's in progress that
23 you will hear about, later in fall.

24 For this specific meeting, we have three requests
25 for presentations on specific consent -- or agenda items.

1 So, for the first presentation, I will invite Raymund
2 Nanadiego from the Basic Training Bureau, as well as Bureau
3 Chief Mike Radford to come to the podium. And they're going
4 to give a report on distraction strikes or blows. And I'll
5 bring to your attention, this report is generated for
6 information only and was done so at the request of a
7 committee member.

8 MR. RADFORD: Thank you, Assistant Director Loggins.
9 Good morning. Again, my name is Mike Radford. I'm the
10 bureau chief for training program services. And we're going
11 to review the courses potentially referencing the term
12 "distraction strikes."

13 In preparation to report on this subject, we
14 conducted a course lookup of performance courses in EBI that
15 may or may not have included the specific or referenced
16 language to distraction strike, using specific titles of
17 courses that would likely contain that language.

18 We first reviewed the basic training curriculums and
19 found that no term such as "distraction strike" was found in
20 any of our basic training courses. So we began a review of
21 inservice courses, searching the following categories: "Use
22 of force," "crowd control," "arrest control," "impact
23 weapons," "SWAT," including basic SWAT, SWAT commander,
24 "ground control," "defensive tactics," and "less lethal."

25 Using these general course terms, all courses with

1 these specific words were identified and reviewed. Of the
2 total courses we reviewed, we -- we reviewed 458 total
3 courses. So, in these particular courses, we found 100
4 particular courses had the term "distraction strike" in some
5 portion of the expanded course outline.

6 The term and description of the word "distraction"
7 is used as a descriptor in the three following manners: No.
8 1, the process of diverting the attention or coordination of
9 an individual or the officer themselves from a desired area
10 of focus. And I should add that this is my definition that
11 I have reviewed through all 100 of the expanded course
12 outlines.

13 No. 2, we found it is the process of diverting the
14 attention or coordination of an individual by certain
15 movements or actions of an officer with no physical contact
16 from the desired area of focus -- from their desired area of
17 focus.

18 And, finally, we found that it would be mean the
19 process of physically striking an individual with either a
20 blunt force object or personal body weapons to -- to divert
21 the attention or coordination of an individual from a
22 desired area of focus. So we saw that there was no
23 discernable or explained the difference between a
24 distraction strike or a standard strike.

25 Some courses did use the word "distraction," and

1 some used the word explicitly referencing distraction
2 strikes and details how to accomplish the strike. Some
3 courses say "distraction techniques," but do not go into
4 specifics about how to perform that particular maneuver.

5 So, finally, presenter may use distraction but not
6 on the way referring to a strike or a kick or a punch.
7 Basically saying the impact being recorded is a distraction
8 in and of itself.

9 So that is our full review of our courses as
10 compared to the term distraction strike. I can open for any
11 questions for in-service and we can take any for any basic
12 training questions.

13 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: If I understand
14 correctly, the -- in the RBC, there was no reference to
15 distraction blows or strikes?

16 MR. NANADIEGO: Good morning. My name is Raymond
17 Nanadiego, Law -- Law Enforcement consultant assigned to
18 basic training bureau. That is correct, as Bureau Chief
19 Radford mentioned, that Learning Domain 33 arrest control
20 does not talk about direct -- distraction strikes, nor does
21 any other learning domain.

22 What is taught in Learning Domain 33 Arrest Control
23 is person weapons, but just as a force option, along with
24 the -- the other principals of arrest and control.

25 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Thank you.

1 Any other questions from committee members?

2 MEMBER HONDA: Yeah. Committee member Honda.

3 Are there any plans to create a standard for POST
4 training with regards to distraction strikes or blows? And
5 the reason why I ask, this has become an issue in the county
6 I work, Santa Cruz County. And there's litigation that the
7 City of Santa Cruz has lost with regards to distraction
8 blows.

9 MEMBER LOGGINS: Mr. Long. That answer to your
10 question is that remains to be seen. POST, our staff,
11 specifically to make a decision on what a distraction blow
12 is or is not, or whether -- what it is with respect to
13 force. Having said that, since it is a -- a matter of
14 force, that is something to entertain if the Commission
15 gives us specific direction to look further into the matter.
16 And, of course, we would seek guidance from a variety of --
17 a vast array of subject matter experts to make sure that
18 whatever is put in our training comports with not only
19 federal law, state statute, particularly AB 392, SB 230,
20 and, of course, Brian v. Conner.

21 MEMBER HONDA: So, as the -- the advisory committee,
22 can we recommend that, for the Commission to proceed
23 forward?

24 MR. LOGGINS: Absolutely. You can -- as an invitor
25 committee, you can influence them and -- and make a --

1 suggest to them that you would like for staff to look
2 further into doing that, and we will do so.

3 MEMBER HONDA: And would that be a motion that I can
4 make in this committee here?

5 MR. LOGGINS: Correct. That would be a motion from
6 either you sir or one of your counter parts and then they
7 seek -- for guidance from the entirety of the committee.

8 MEMBER HONDA: Okay. Then, having said that, then I
9 would like a make motion for the Commission to approve
10 moving forward with a little more research on how POST can
11 regulate or train on the use of distraction blows or
12 strikes.

13 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: We have a motion.
14 Is there a second?

15 MEMBER OBORN: Kathy Oborn. Second.

16 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Any further discussion on
17 this?

18 MEMBER WEBB: This is Webb. I just -- I'm sure
19 it'll be included in the study. My concern with this is,
20 you know, coming up with some sort of def- -- you know, how
21 do you determine what's a distraction blow and what isn't a
22 distraction blow and where or when it is appropriate. A lot
23 of things, I think, need to be considered with that, but I
24 support some research into that. For sure.

25 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Anybody else?

1 MEMBER WEBER: This is Weber. Just interested in --
2 in getting a little bit more context. Is this a new -- it
3 sounds like a new, recent development.

4 Is there any additional context around the -- this
5 raising to an issue of being researched and looked at? Is
6 this -- it sounds like it's happening in your field. Is
7 that the case?

8 MEMBER HONDA: Yes. Committee Member Honda.

9 Yeah, we had -- I mean, in my experience, I've been
10 in law enforcement for almost 31 years. And it's common
11 practice -- whether -- I don't recall if it was trained in
12 the academy, but definitely within our field training
13 program at the agency that I work for, common practice to
14 use distraction blows for officer safety to help take
15 someone into custody. But, recently, under the -- with the
16 event of body-worn cameras and other video formats that --
17 it -- the optics of an office using a distraction blows,
18 even though it's justified, can -- can look a little
19 excessive, even though it may not be.

20 So I -- I feel that there's a need to address that
21 in some type of training moved forward, just to protect the
22 communities that we serve and also protect the officers as
23 they're trying to enforce their jobs safely.

24 MEMBER WEBER: Thank you.

25 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Chief Honda, so I --

1 understanding the motion, it is that we -- our committee
2 recommend that the Commission direct staff to research
3 regulation and training of distraction strike or distraction
4 blows; is that --

5 MEMBER HONDA: That's correct.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Okay. Any other comments
7 or questions on this before we go to a vote?

8 MEMBER SALAZAR: So -- so, for Chief Honda, just
9 clarification, is it coming up with a definition, like a
10 standard definition or to research a particular technique?

11 MEMBER HONDA: I think -- it's a little of both. I
12 think we need to come up with a definition to kind of create
13 a standard so we can train our officers, but also educate
14 the public on what a distraction blow is.

15 In the County of Santa Cruz, the Santa Cruz Police
16 Department has just recently lost a lawsuit with regards to
17 distraction blows. And that -- the technique used is -- is
18 a very common use of those types of strikes that we were
19 commonly taught in the -- in training earlier on in my
20 career, so -- does that answer your question?

21 MEMBER SALAZAR: I think so. I'm sensing the intent
22 is kind of similar to an impact weapon. What is the intent
23 of the blow and technique-type of an approach.

24 MEMBER HONDA: That's correct.

25 MEMBER SALAZAR: Okay.

1 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Do you have a comment?

2 MEMBER SANDOVAL: I do. I actually have a question.
3 I just want to get specific on this.

4 Did you -- are you looking at research into
5 in-service, academy, or both?

6 MEMBER HONDA: Actually, haven't thought about it
7 that much. But I think it would -- it would be appropriate
8 to teach it in the academies before an officer actually gets
9 out in the street and also probably apropos to teach during
10 the FTO program. So -- so they're going out -- as new
11 officers, they already have an understanding what a
12 distraction blow is, and there's some kind of standard to
13 manage that.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Any other discussion?

15 MEMBER BANNING: Chief, I have a question. Without
16 -- Chief Honda, was that -- the Santa Cruz decision, was
17 that a negotiated settlement, or was that a -- a jury
18 settlement? I mean, I -- I don't -- I don't think it has
19 any bearing on your motion. I'm just curious, given the
20 diversity of different counties and how different groups
21 might see that, throughout the state.

22 MEMBER HONDA: I don't know the details of the
23 actual litigation, so I would have to do some research on
24 that.

25 MEMBER BANNING: Okay. Thank you.

1 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Anything else?

2 (No response.)

3 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Okay. Committee members,
4 I'm going to call for a vote. Lets do's this: Leisurely,
5 with a thumbs up on the screen, all in favor with a thumbs
6 up on the screen.

7 (Members comply.)

8 Okay. Any opposed, either speak now or put your
9 thumb down.

10 (No response.)

11 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Okay. Motion carries.

12 We will make that recommendation to the commission.

13 MR. LOGGINS: Very well. Thank you very much, Chair
14 Waltz. And thank you, Committee Honda, for bringing that
15 forward.

16 At this point, I will ask Bureau Chief Radford to
17 remain in place. He is going to give a presentation on Item
18 No. 12, which is a report on the update of 1070 Instructor
19 Refresher Training.

20 MR. RADFORD: Thank you. This will be pretty brief,
21 but let me give me a report on an update of the 1070
22 Instructor Refresher Training.

23 Currently, with no regulation requiring refresher or
24 update training for 1070 course, an effort to ensure 1070
25 courses are maintaining current and relevant training, POST

1 is taking proactive steps and is in the beginning stages of
2 information gathering to see if instructors of certain
3 courses should be required to take refresher training.

4 So our focus will first be on the subjects of arrest
5 and control, firearms, EVOC, and use of force. Subject
6 matter experts are being identified and will be consulted in
7 determining the following: Should a particular subject
8 require refresher training for instructors; what will the
9 minimum length of training consist of for the subject; what
10 frequency should the refresher training be -- 2 years,
11 5 years, et cetera -- should there be a process for
12 equivalency; what should the minimum learning objectives for
13 the -- for the refresher training be.

14 So once this information has been received from the
15 subject matter experts and the subject fields described,
16 recommendations will be brought to the Commission at a
17 future date for the consideration.

18 With this, that concludes my update, and I'm open
19 for any questions.

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Any questions or comments
21 from committee members?

22 MR. LOGGINS: Mr. Chair, if I may add, from staff's
23 perspective, staff took this initiative. Antidotally, the
24 vast majority of instructors self-police themselves and send
25 themselves to refresher training to keep themselves current

1 and make sure their skills do not -- are not perishable.

2 Having said that, staff has seen a possible need to
3 mandate the refresher training, particularly in those
4 high-risk areas. Such as use of force where the legislation
5 and the law is constantly evolving and community
6 expectations are ever increasing. So this is just the first
7 step in taking that initiating -- initiative process to make
8 our instructors that much better.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Thank you for that.

10 Director Alvarez?

11 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ALVAREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12 If I may also add, there is no 1070 requirement for
13 use of force. We do feel that there needs to be a
14 requirement for that 1070 to kick into place for use of
15 force training. As many of you know, at the last commission
16 meeting in February, the Commission approved a new PSP
17 mandate for use of force. We feel that the instructors need
18 to have some level of legal instruction on current laws
19 related to -- to use of force, both after the passage of AB
20 392 and the modification of the Penal Code, as well as to SB
21 230 and the different requirements that were imposed on
22 agencies to include in policy. So we do feel that we need
23 to create that. It is not in place at this point. So there
24 is no refresher for use of force.

25 The challenges for us are how many instructors are

1 out there and how many of them teach various -- various
2 topics. So you could have a use of force instructor that
3 also teaches EVOC, EVOC or emergency vehicle operation, is a
4 1070 requirement -- there's a 1070 requirement for --
5 obviously, EVOC for driving for slow speed. There's a 1070
6 requirement for high speed. There's a 1070 requirement for
7 handgun or pistol. There is a 1070 for rifle. So how we --
8 how we formulate that and deliver, so that it does not
9 negatively impact the field is also something that we're
10 trying to grapple with.

11 So it's a -- it seems like a simple issue for -- for
12 us to deal with, to just create a refresher course, but how
13 it's delivered is also equally as important. When you talk
14 about use of force, use of force obviously applies to many
15 different areas, including arrest and control and firearms.
16 So how -- how we deliver it without creating havoc is -- is
17 a significant concern for us.

18 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19 MR. LOGGINS: Mr. Chair, if I may add one more
20 thing, this would be a significant investment and -- from
21 our community college parties as well. By mandate of the
22 Penal Code, we as POST, are only able to reimburse for
23 training for on-duty, active peace officers.

24 A significant number of our subject matter experts
25 that teach in the community college forum are either retired

1 law enforcement officers or other experts in their
2 respective fields. And we are prohibited from reimbursing
3 them for their training. So this will definitely be --
4 necessitate a commitment from the community college partners
5 in helping train our -- or future instructors.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Would that same situation
7 apply to reserve officers?

8 MR. LOGGINS. Yes, that would.

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: For the nonreimbursement?

10 MR. LOGGINS: That's correct.

11 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ALVAREZ: If I may, Mr. Chair?

12 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Yes.

13 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ALVAREZ: So one of the things
14 that we have been able to gain, specifically with the
15 community colleges to bring the training to the region to
16 allow those community college personnel and law enforcement
17 personnel to participate in training, and that is one
18 possible way to employ this without having a significant
19 financial impact to the colleges. We've done that with the
20 Academy Instructor Certification Program, AICC, where we
21 brought it locally so there are not a great deal of
22 significant costs to the colleges. But, Scott, is -- is
23 very ac- -- is very correct, in that we understand those
24 challenges for the colleges.

25 Thank you, sir.

1 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Thank you.

2 Any other comments or questions?

3 (Overlapping responses.)

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Salazar.

5 MEMBER SALAZAR: I would just -- I would say I
6 support this change. I think it's definitely a good idea,
7 considering the focus on -- particularly use of force with
8 those high-risk operations. The concern was, obviously,
9 just as Director Alvarez mentioned, the logistics of it and
10 finding a way to do without having a -- a negative impact on
11 the field. But I definitely think it's necessary. So I
12 appreciate the report coming forward.

13 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Thank you.

14 There was another comment I heard.

15 MEMBER WEBER: This is Weber. Just a quick
16 question.

17 Is there a time frame for the refresher that's being
18 recommended? Every --

19 MR. LOGGINS: Good morning. There is no time frame
20 yet. We're in the infancy of -- of looking at this process.
21 So Bureau Chief Radford and his staff are probably going
22 bring a formal proposal to the Commission probably sometime
23 this fall.

24 MEMBER WEBER: Thank you. And we appreciate the
25 consideration of cost to the community college system, and

1 we will -- we're committed to partnering with you to look at
2 how we might, you know, consider and look -- look at
3 reducing those costs and impacts.

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Any other questions or
5 comments?

6 (No response.)

7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Thank you. Mike.

8 MR. LOGGINS: Thank you very much, committee
9 members.

10 Mr. Chair, for the final presentation, I'm going to
11 invite Kirk Bunch. And he is going to give a report on
12 proposed changes to the minimum training requirements for
13 district attorney investigators, which is Commission
14 Regulation 1005. And it looks like he's being accompanied
15 by Bureau Chief Jim Grottkau, and they're both from the
16 basic training bureau.

17 MR. BUNCH: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Good morning,
18 committee. My name is Kirk Bunch. I'm a law enforcement
19 consultant with the Basic Training Bureau. I'm going to
20 provide information on proposed changes to the minimum
21 training requirements for district attorney investigators,
22 Commission Regulation 1005.

23 Currently Commission Regulation 1005(a) requires the
24 completion of the POST regular basic course, also known as
25 "RBC," for district attorney investigators, which excludes

1 those individuals who have completed the POST-specialized
2 investigator basic course, also known as "SIBC," from being
3 appointed as district attorney investigator.

4 Recently and in the past, POST has received numerous
5 inquiries about a method to allow individuals who qualify
6 for California law enforcement investigator positions to
7 become district attorney investigators. At the
8 February 2021 commission meeting, POST staff was directed by
9 the Commission to look at options allowing the training,
10 SIBC, completed by those individuals to qualify for district
11 attorney investigator positions.

12 The regular basic course, or "RBC," is designed for
13 general law enforcement and includes specific training on
14 topics which includes traffic enforcement, patrol
15 techniques, and handling of calls for service incidents.
16 The specialized investigator basic course, SIBC, is designed
17 for investigators and includes specific training in
18 investigative topics such as presentation of evidence,
19 computers, and computer crime, et cetera.

20 Commission Regulation 1005 -- 1005 defines general
21 law enforcement as duties which include the investigations
22 of crime, patrol of geographic area, responding to the full
23 range of requests for police services, and in performing any
24 enforcement action on a full range of law violations.
25 Therefore, graduates of the SIBC are not eligible for

1 appointment as general law enforcement peace officers
2 without completion of a RBC course.

3 Staff have updated Commission Regulating 1005(a)
4 which is in Attachment A, to allow completion of the RBC or
5 SIBC to meet the training requirements for district attorney
6 investigators. This change will provide a district
7 attorney's office the ability to hire individuals who have
8 completed the SIBC or maintain the current training
9 requirement of the RBC.

10 Staff recommends that the revisions to the
11 Commission Regulation 1005(a) be amended pursuant to the
12 rulemaking process in the Office of Administrative law, OAL.
13 If no one requests a public hearing, the amendments will
14 become effective January 1, 2022.

15 Thank you. And we're open to any questions you
16 might have.

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: I know last meeting there
18 was some discussion about gap training for people who had
19 SIBC. Is there any consideration for that still, or is that
20 no longer part of it?

21 MR. GROTTKAU: We -- we -- this is Jim Grottkau.
22 I'm the Bureau Chief for basic training. We did a lot of
23 research internally, and it was determined that the easiest
24 solution for this would be to amend the regulation to allow
25 district attorney's office to hire either SIBC or RBC, as

1 opposed to a course that -- a bridge course that would be
2 potentially not sustainable and may be a cost burden that is
3 overwhelming to attendees and the presenters. So this was a
4 solution that we looked at as being a better option for
5 that.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Thank you.

7 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ALVAREZ: Mr. Chair, if I may
8 add?

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Yes.

10 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ALVAREZ: In terms of that bridge
11 course, some of the other comments, which are righteous
12 comments, I believe, if that bridge course were to be
13 created, there were some concerns that individuals that had
14 gone through the SIBC years and years ago, now with --
15 through a bridge course, now have the ability to police
16 officers and deputy sheriffs. And that leap may be a bit
17 much. So this is kind of the middle ground, so to speak.

18 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Thank you.

19 Any other questions or comments, committee members
20 or staff?

21 (No response.)

22 MR. LOGGINS: Very well. Hearing none, thank you
23 very much, Mr. Chair. That concludes staffs' presentation
24 of the agenda review.

25 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Thank you.

1 It is my intention to get our committee's
2 recommendation on each of the items on the agenda. I'll be
3 starting with the one we just discussed, Item D, as in
4 David.

5 Do any committee members object to our
6 recommendation to -- for the Commission to approve this
7 item?

8 (No response.)

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: We will make that
10 recommendation to the Commission.

11 I'll move to Item E, which is a revision to testing,
12 a -- notification requirements for basic course presenters.
13 It includes notifying of student's employing agency
14 following initial test failure and notifying basic training
15 bureau when 15 percent or more of the students attending the
16 course fail any POST-required scenario or exercise.

17 Do any committee members object to our
18 recommendation to approve this item?

19 (No response.)

20 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: We will make that
21 recommendation.

22 Item F, proposed changes to the training and testing
23 specifications for the requalification course.

24 Do any of our committee members object to our
25 recommendation for the Commission to approve this item?

1 (No response.)

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: We will make that
3 recommendation.

4 And, finally, Item No. -- Item G, request to amend
5 Regulation 1081, Requirement For Human Trafficking.

6 Do any committee members object to our
7 recommendation for the commission to approve this item?

8 (No response.)

9 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: We will make that
10 recommendation.

11 Do any members have any comments or questions on any
12 of the agenda items, including those we discussed?

13 (No response.)

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: You're making this easy
15 for me.

16 Now, we will move to advisory committee member
17 reports.

18 Do any advisory committee members have anything to
19 report?

20 MEMBER OBORN: Oborn with CAAJE. We held a
21 conference -- or summit last week. I wanted to thank
22 Scott Loggins for participating, giving us the POST
23 legislative update. And I wanted to also let Scott know we
24 got a lot of evaluations back from the members that
25 attended, and they appreciated having that connection with

1 POST with our organization, CAAJE, and had said -- and
2 commented on how important it was for the people that have
3 academies on community colleges to know what legislative
4 updates there are. And I also did speak with Scott about
5 having a link on our CAAJE website for those interested
6 people to be able to access information.

7 We have some great speaker that covered a lot of
8 topics, and I was -- I was hoping that our chancellor would
9 had -- would be able to be there to listen to -- to the
10 comments and -- and the presentations, but he was unable to
11 make it, unfortunately. But we will have it posted on the
12 CAAJE website so people can review it if they want to.

13 Anyway, again, I just wanted to thank Scott for
14 being there and being part of the presentations.

15 MR. LOGGINS: Thank you very much -- thank you very
16 much, Ms. Oborn, and likewise, we value the partnership with
17 our -- our community college partners. It's an invaluable
18 resource. And I was very impressed with the members of the
19 board. It was an outstanding day.

20 And I will say -- on a personal note, I truly think
21 the community colleges are the gateway to the American
22 dream. I'm a product of the community colleges system. So
23 I -- I would hope that would be characterized as a success.
24 So thank you very much for the invitation last week.

25 MEMBER OBORN: Thank you.

1 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Any other committee
2 member reports?

3 MEMBER HONDA: Committee Member Honda.

4 I noticed this -- it's on the new business part of
5 the agenda, but I just want to announce that this will be my
6 last meeting representing the California Peace Officer
7 Association, as I will be officially retiring from law
8 enforcement in a month.

9 So I just wanted to say it's been an honor serving
10 this commission and the CPOA and the law enforcement
11 community. And I just wanted to thank everyone here for
12 just -- it's been a wonderful experience, and I thank you
13 for the opportunity.

14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Thank you, Chief Honda,
15 and congratulations on your upcoming retirement. And we
16 definitely appreciate the input and insights that you have
17 brought to the table here. You started off right away with
18 adding some substance and some insight from your
19 perspective, and it's been much appreciated.

20 MEMBER HONDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 MEMBER WEBER: This is Weber. I would like to just
22 share some information with you regarding some work that's
23 happening in the California College System. As a result of
24 the call to action that was issued last June from our system
25 for our diversity equity inclusion, we have embarked on --

1 one of the focuses, looking at the campus climate and
2 culture. And related to that is really the policing on
3 campus and how that interfaces with students. The 116
4 campuses and colleges that we have in our systems, many of
5 them hire peace officers to provide public safety functions
6 on our campus. And all -- as well as individuals that
7 provide property safety functions.

8 Additionally, there's -- a number of our campuses
9 contract with local law enforcement agencies to provide
10 public safety activities on campus. And one of -- one of
11 the activities is a task force that we have formed that has
12 met since January to look at the campus policing climate and
13 culture and having discussions about how that -- how those
14 interactions and those functions support students or -- or
15 impact students and how does that relate to student success
16 and having discussions about what campus policing should
17 look like within our system. And so that's going to
18 continue throughout the -- the -- the year and finishing up
19 in January of next year. I'm happy to provide reports and
20 updates to this advisory committee if there's interest in --
21 in learning more about those conversations.

22 Another part of -- of our sort of analysis and
23 assessment is doing a landscape analysis of the 19 basic
24 police academy curriculum delivery and -- and
25 understanding -- getting a better understanding of how those

1 programs are being delivered, and I'm happy to share --
2 report on that as well, if there's any interest. So just
3 wanted to share those two pieces of information.

4 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Thank you.

5 Any further reports?

6 MEMBER WEB: This is Webb. I don't have a report,
7 but I would like to tell Ms. Weber that I'm very interested
8 in hearing more about that.

9 MEMBER OBORN: Oborn. I have a question for Vice
10 Chancellor Weber.

11 Is -- so -- so at my campus, through my district, I
12 received a survey asking how I felt about having the -- the
13 sheriff's department on our campus. Is that -- is this part
14 of something statewide through each of their community
15 college districts?

16 MEMBER WEBER: I'm -- I'm not aware particularly
17 of -- of the -- the survey that you're asking about as -- as
18 related to that particular question. I don't know if that
19 is part of the surveys that we're doing or it's -- you know,
20 so maybe we can take a look at that and have that
21 conversation offline.

22 MEMBER OBORN: Yeah. I'm just wondering how they're
23 gathering that data. And we just got one sent in our --
24 sent to our e-mail, and I was just wondering if that was
25 related to that.

1 MEMBER WEBER: It does not sound like it's related.
2 We are doing a series of surveys, though, related to better
3 understanding policing on campus, necessary related to -- to
4 specific agencies. So I can certainly look more into that.

5 MEMBER OBORN: Okay. Thank you.

6 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Anybody else?

7 I keep looking at Damien Sandoval, and he's been
8 smiling the whole time that we've been here.

9 MR. LOGGINS: Mr. Chair, if I may indulge, on behalf
10 of staff, I would like to thank Chief Honda for -- not only
11 his service here as a committee member, you had a direct,
12 significant level of influence on training 90,000 cops
13 across the entire state of California, but also for your
14 service as a law enforcement officer, serving as -- in this
15 most noble of professions. So I'm truly appreciative of all
16 that you've done and look forward to see what you do in the
17 next steps.

18 With that, I would also like to -- to invite Ezery
19 Beauchamp, who is now representing the California Highway
20 Patrol. He's a chief for that organization, and we've had
21 some interactions internally with POST with him. And we're
22 very impressed with his -- his skill set and his -- his
23 enthusiasm for contributing to the law enforcement mission.
24 So welcome, Ezery.

25 MEMBER BEAUCHAMP: Thank you very much. I

1 appreciate it.

2 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: My report isn't quite a
3 report yet, but I -- as a representative of CAPTO,
4 California Association of Police Training Officers, we are
5 about to start a new outreach. And I will hopefully be able
6 the report on that at the next meeting. But it includes
7 having a -- a retiree who's going to be an ambassador to go
8 out and do some interfacing, not only with unrepresented
9 areas, but with some of the LETMAs -- the Law Enforcement
10 Training Manager Associations that are scattered all
11 throughout the state, which will coincide with the intent of
12 the Commission on the reorganization of our committee, to
13 have that inclusion of law enforcement training managers
14 throughout the state.

15 Any other reports?

16 (No response.)

17 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: We'll move on now to
18 commissioner comments. Are there any commissioners who wish
19 to make any comments in this meeting?

20 (No response.)

21 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: And it appears there are
22 none, which brings us to old business. And there is no old
23 business.

24 New business. I will ask for new business now.

25 MR. LOGGINS: Yes, the -- the only new business, Mr.

1 Chair is a -- several letters. The first is a letter from
2 Craig Lally, president of the California Coalition of Law
3 Association, CCLA, nominating president Juan Viramontes of
4 the Association of Orange County Deputy Sheriffs for
5 appointment to the advisory committee, replacing Sr. Deputy
6 Coroner Artin Baron, who recently was promoted.

7 We also have a letter from Carol Leveroni, who's the
8 executive director for the California Peace Officers
9 Association, CPOA, nominating Lieutenant Eric Swift from the
10 Nape County Sheriff Department for appointment to the
11 advisory committee, replacing Dave Honda, who, as you all
12 know, is retiring soon.

13 And we have a list that we're going to review, the
14 committee term -- committee member terms and nominations.
15 But, rather than go forward with that, I will simply have
16 POST staff e-mail you a list showing everybody when the
17 terms and nominations started and will end. And that is the
18 end of my presentation, sir.

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Thank you.

20 Executive Director Alvarez has some comments.

21 Executive Director Alvarez: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

22 I apologize for re-interjecting here towards the end. I
23 wanted to clarify some terminology that I used during the
24 presentation by my colleagues Kirk and Jim on the DA
25 investigator course -- or the DA investigator training. I

1 used the term "middle ground," and I caught myself after I
2 said that, saying that comes across as a compromise to a
3 solution. And it's not in that. I know that there's going
4 to be some discussion at commission meetings, and I didn't
5 want that to -- to come across as a compromise. I -- I will
6 speak at the next meeting should it come up and -- and state
7 that I do believe that the SIBC is the proper training
8 course for DA investigators. But I would like to retract my
9 wording of "middle ground" as a -- you know, as a -- as a
10 compromise.

11 Second of all, I would also like to thank Chief
12 Honda for all of his time in law enforcement, both at the
13 Santa Jose Police Department and at the Watsonville Police
14 Department for his many years of service and his friendship
15 and, you know, speaking out on behalf of CPOA and,
16 obviously, bringing issues like the distraction blows to our
17 attention. Thank you for always being there to -- to do
18 that.

19 And, lastly, between this and the last commission --
20 the last series of commission meetings, there was also
21 another announcement of the retirement. That person is on
22 the screen, has not raised his hand to say that he is
23 officially in that same situation, but I would also like to
24 thank Sergeant P.J. Webb -- or former Sergeant P.J. Webb
25 from the LA Unified School District Police Department. He

1 also announced his retirement.

2 LA Unified School District Police Department, like
3 many other police departments in California, has had a lot
4 of scrutiny over the last six month or nine months or a
5 year. And I know P.J. had been unable to attend some -- I
6 think the last meeting, if I'm not mistaken, P.J., just
7 based on meetings and discussions that your department has
8 had to have with the -- with the city or with the school
9 district. So I just want also thank you, P.J., for your
10 time on -- on the commission.

11 I think based on the size of LA Unified School
12 District Police Department, the number of school district
13 police departments that are represented in California, it's
14 been a -- it's been a benefit to us to have you on the
15 board. And just want to thank you for your service as well.
16 Thank you, P.J.

17 That's it, Mr. Chair.

18 MEMBER WEBB: Thank you very much.

19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: Our future meetings, our
20 upcoming meetings for this year are September 1st and 2nd in
21 Pasadena; December 8th and 9th, here at POST headquarters in
22 West Sacramento; and for 2022, March 2nd and 3rd, that
23 location is to be determined; and May 25th and 26th, here at
24 POST headquarters.

25 Anything else before we adjourn?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WALTZ: We are adjourned.

(Proceedings concluded at 10:57 A.M.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, VERONICA A. GUERRERO, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing proceedings were reported, to the best of my ability, in shorthand by me, Veronica A. Guerrero, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said proceedings nor in any way interested in the outcome of said proceedings.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 21st day of June 2021.

/s/ Veronica A. Guerrero

VERONICA A. GUERRERO, CSR

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 14129

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

E R R A T A S H E E T

Page_____ Line_____ Reason for change:

Page_____ Line_____ Reason for change:

Page_____ Line_____ Reason for change:

Page_____ Line_____ Reason for change:

Page_____ Line_____ Reason for change:

Page_____ Line_____ Reason for change:

Page_____ Line_____ Reason for change:

Page_____ Line_____ Reason for change:

Page_____ Line_____ Reason for change:

Page_____ Line_____ Reason for change:
